

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

FILED  
IN CLERKS OFFICE  
2004 JUL -7 P 12:17

DOCKET NO. 03-CR-10367 MEL

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASS.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )  
 )  
VS. )  
 )  
JAMES T. RICHARDS )  
 )

MOTION THAT JUSTICE LASKER RECUSE HIMSELF

Now comes defendant and hereby requests that Justice Lasker immediately recuse himself from further hearing any aspect of this case.

As reason therefore, defendant states:

- (1) that Justice Lasker is biased and prejudiced, in violation of the Federal Code of Judicial Responsibility;
- (2) that Justice Lasker belongs to an organization (Judaism) which invidiously discriminates against American citizens, in violation of the Federal Code of Judicial Responsibility;
- (3) that Justice Lasker has failed and/or refused to hear motions properly submitted by defendant;
- (4) that Justice Lasker did nothing to stop the government's interference with defendant's mail, including mail to the court in this case;
- (5) that Justice Lasker, at the June 8, 2004 hearing, refused to let defendant state all the outstanding motions which should have been scheduled for consideration;
- (6) that Justice Lasker didn't let defendant state all the reasons why he wanted federal defender Miriam Conrad discharged as counsel, and not imposed on defendant as standby counsel;
- (7) that Justice Lasker had the June 8, 2004 hearing improperly sealed without informing defendant and without giving defendant a hearing on the matter;

(8) that defendant believes Justice Lasker may have asked defendant a question beginning with the phrase, "When you are convicted..." or words to that direct effect, which if defendant heard Justice Lasker accurately said phrase indicated prejudice in the extreme;

(9) that Justice Lasker stuck defendant with Attorney Miriam Conrad as his standby attorney, despite major documented differences between defendant and Ms. Conrad, major personality differences, a total absence of trust by defendant toward Ms. Conrad, and repeated failure of Ms. Conrad to be a woman of her word and do what she said she would do;

(10) that Justice Lasker's interests as a Jewish person are directly adverse to those of defendant and can't help but prejudice him in this case;

(11) that Justice Lasker, because he is Jewish, is of far greater questionable mental competence than defendant was when Justice Lasker recently ordered that defendant be subjected to a psychiatric evaluation to determine defendant's competence to stand trial (a test which defendant passed with no problem);

(12) that during the June 8, 2004 hearing the court stenographer made inappropriate, unprofessional facial expressions of disapproval toward defendant, which is absolutely out of line and could indicate that Justice Lasker doesn't have appropriate control over the personnel in his courtroom;

(13) that Justice Lasker is reportedly a liberal whose principles apparently have been warped by his long years as a judge so that instead of listening to defendant and being polite and trying to be fair; he instead on a number of issues chose to shove things down defendant's throat, presumably because he has become the very kind of dictatorial bully who at one time he probably vehemently detested (which is, of course, an occupational risk, since all courtrooms are dictatorships, and where a judge stands in the range from benevolent dictator to tyrant will hugely affect the fairness of the court's proceedings;

(14) that Justice Lasker is so inculcated in American jurisprudence that he, like the system itself, is pathologically incapable of protecting defendant's little girl. Defendant would have had better protection for his daughter if he had been living back in cave-man days than he's had with the assortment of clowns, idiots, poseurs and incompetents who populate the so-


called child protective agencies of the government, including the court;

(15) that defendant should have an active judge, not a retired one, as befits the importance of the case;

(16) that in December, 2003, defendant made a death threat against all the judges in U.S. District Court except for Justice Nancy Gertner, and a threat by a defendant against a judge can't help but prejudice the judge against the defendant.

Defendant hereby incorporates by reference his accompanying memorandum ~~and exhibit one~~ in support of this motion, and he also incorporates all previous motions and supporting affidavits regarding the discharge of Attorney Conrad and motions that defendant be allowed to represent himself. JR

Respectfully submitted on July 1, 2004,

  
James T. Richards  
N.C.C.C., PMD-9  
200 West St.  
Dedham, MA 02027

FILED  
IN CLERKS OFFICE

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION THAT JUSTICE LASKER RECUSE HIMSELF

Refusal to hear motions -- Prior to June 8, 2004, defendant submitted eight (8) motions and a request for injunctive relief to be heard at the next hearing date (6/8/04) and Justice Lasker failed and/or refused to hear six of the motions or the request for injunctive relief (the motions were: (1) motion for library access; (2) motion for access to needed documents; (3) motion for return of confiscated items, or copies thereof; (4) motion for production of documents; (5) motion for hearing for outstanding motions; (6) motion for funds) (it appears from the docket that the motion for library access and the motion for access to needed documents were not docketed until 6/14/04, even though they were sent to the court on 5/19/04);

Refusal to stop government's interference with defendant's mail -- When defendant told Justice Lasker that he was having serious problems getting his mail delivered, including legal documents related to the instant case, and that it appeared that the delivery of his correspondence was being obstructed in violation of federal law, Justice Lasker expressed no concern whatsoever about this violation of defendant's rights and he didn't do a thing about it or ask any questions about it, as if the obstruction of correspondence by government officials was of no importance;

Refusal to allow defendant to state all outstanding motions -- When defendant told Justice Lasker at the June 8, 2004 hearing that he had a number of items to be heard that day, defendant's recollection is that upon the judge's request defendant started to itemize the motions and the request for injunctive relief that were up for hearing and that Justice Lasker refused to allow defendant to list all the items;

Refusal to allow defendant to list all reasons why Attorney Conrad should be discharged -- When Justice Lasker asked defendant why he didn't want federal defender attorney Miriam Conrad to represent him, defendant started listing the many reasons why he didn't want Ms. Conrad, yet rather than allow defendant to verbally list all the reasons Justice Lasker cut defendant short before he was even halfway done, and when defendant later asked that he be allowed to finish the list Justice Lasker wouldn't let him;

Imposing upon defendant Miriam Conrad as defendant's standby attorney -- Justice Lasker allowed defendant's request that

defendant be permitted to represent himself, yet he nevertheless stuck him with federal defender Miriam Conrad (who had been the acting attorney in the case) as defendant's standby attorney, even though defendant repeatedly told magistrate Justice Dein and Justice Lasker, both in person and by motion, that he didn't trust Ms. Conrad and that he did not believe, based on copious evidence, that she was not working in his best interests, and who since June 8, 2004 (the date of the most recent hearing) once again failed to fulfill an important promise to defendant (she said on June 8, 2004 she would send defendant a copy of the docket entries to the case, and she failed to do so, so that defendant, after waiting until June 16, 2004 and still not receiving a copy of the docket entries, finally had to contact Ms. Conrad again, and she finally sent defendant a copy of the docket entries); and defendant further stated to Ms. Conrad personally, and in motions and affidavits to the court (with copies to Ms. Conrad) that he was working to destroy Judaism, and although Ms. Conrad refused to say whether or not she was Jewish defendant has good reason to believe that she is, so that there is an obvious conflict of interest for Ms. Conrad which defendant believes she is required by her Code of Professional Responsibility to divulge to defendant and/or to the court which she has deliberately failed and refused to divulge by saying whether or not she is Jewish; and as a result of defendant's numerous experiences with Ms. Conrad defendant will simply not use her in this case unless desperate, since whatever he asks her to do he must also do himself anyway because he simply cannot trust, from past experience, that when Ms. Conrad promises to do something she will do it; and Ms. Conrad has admitted in open court that she has failed to do things she should have done or which she had promised to do, and she is allowed to get away with these failures and broken promises apparently because she has endeared herself to judges such as Justice Lasker, so that what Justice Lasker wouldn't allow from an attorney who hasn't gained his favor he does allow from Ms. Conrad, and wrongly so, and to defendant's detriment;

Justice Lasker's interests are directly adverse to those of defendant -- Justice Lasker, because he is Jewish, necessarily has divided loyalty between the United States and Israel, and because defendant has expressed in court documents that he believes that Israel's Jews greatly wronged the Palestinians and owe them huge reparations, and that the deaths of 3,000 Americans on 9/11/01 occurred primarily because of America's support of Israel, and that the people of the United States are greatly endangered by their government's continued support of Israel, Justice Lasker's interests as a Jewish person are

directly adverse to those of defendant and can't help but prejudice him in this case;

Justice Lasker's mental competence is questionable -- Justice Lasker, because he is Jewish, is of far greater questionable mental competence than defendant was when Justice Lasker recently ordered that defendant be subjected to a psychiatric evaluation to determine defendant's competence to stand trial (a test which defendant passed with flying colors), because as a Jewish person Justice Lasker can be presumed to believe, among other delusional things: (1) that snakes, shrubs and donkeys (Numbers 22:28) can talk; (2) that parents should mutilate the genitals of their infant boys and thereby impair their later sex life as adults because a shrub said to do so; (3) that the god of the Israelites is a suitable god to worship, even though he murdered a lot of Egyptian children (Exodus 12:29), though as a supposedly omnipotent god he presumably could have killed Egyptian soldiers or he could have freed the Israelites simply by snapping his fingers; (4) that the god of the Israelites is omniscient and made the Israelites his chosen people, which is delusional, since why would he give his chosen people arid, barren Israel as their promised land rather than North America, with its amber waves of grain, its lakes and rivers teeming with fish, and its prairies and forests filled with game unless he either ripped off his own chosen people, or he didn't even know North America existed, in which case he wasn't omniscient at all and was more likely a concoction of the Israelites themselves, perhaps to cover the fact that it was the Israelites themselves, not some god, who murdered all those Egyptian children; (5) that the god of the Israelites said such silly things as "Honor thy Father and Mother", because if the god of the Israelites was omniscient he would know that some parents abuse their children, and such parents should not be honored; (6) that it is wrong for Justice Lasker and other Jewish people to eat pork fried rice, pork chops, ham sandwiches or BLT's because a shrub said not to. Furthermore, Justice Lasker and most other Jewish people can't tell right from wrong with respect to the Palestinians, and an inability to distinguish right from wrong on fundamental issues regarding human life is a sign of insanity, and Justice Lasker, if he is like most Jewish people, is so cognitively impaired due to his deeply inculcated delusions and myths that he can't see how Jewish beliefs and actions are so self-injurious that once again they are on the verge of getting a lot of Jewish people killed who could easily live if they dispensed with the delusion that they are any more special in God's eyes than other groups of people and instead of maintaining their unfair policies towards the Palestinians they should use American principles of equity and fairness to admit their wrongdoing and put things as



right as possible for the Palestinians, plus they should dispense with the delusion that the Jews are collectively smarter than everyone else, because one huge measure of intelligence is an ability to survive and the Jews have been extraordinarily unsuccessful by that measure, and most of the great thinkers in western Civilization have not been Jewish, including: Newton, Galileo, Copernicus, Darwin, Mendel, Kepler, Pasteur, Aristotle, Euclid, Archimedes, Galen, Descartes, Kant, Keynes, Locke, Nietzsche, Socrates, Plato, Milton, Mozart, Michelangelo, DaVinci, Shakespeare, Chaucer, Charlemagne, Homer, Plutarch, Edison, Fahrenheit, Faraday, Bacon, Franklin, Marconi, Jefferson, Alexander Graham Bell, George Washington Carver, Julius Caesar, Alexander the Great, Napoleon, Beethoven, Watson, Crick, and numerous others. To suggest that the Jews are the chosen people and that those mentioned above, and everyone else, are not God's chosen people is silly.

Furthermore, the Jewish people are so blindly fanatical that they would rather that they and all their children die than accept as their messiah someone from the House of Levi or the Book of Mormon or some great Arab warrior whose only eccentricity is that he walks backwards everywhere he goes - and because the Jews (with Justice Lasker presumably among them) so greatly limit their options and subject themselves and their children to such great and avoidable risks, their religion itself can be rightly considered to be a religion of mentally disturbed people (although to their credit they don't get together every weekend like the Catholics and eat the body and drink the blood of a dead Jewish person, nor do they think that god says you can't go to a doctor or have a blood transfusion, etc.).

Logic says that there are only two types of Jewish people in the world: those who have been profoundly and adversely affected by the Holocaust and related horrors of Jewish history, and those who haven't, and those who have been adversely affected suffer from mental problems akin to those of past-traumatic stress disorder, and those who haven't are suffering from deep denial, because reality says they should be adversely affected by the events of the Holocaust and related horrors of Jewish history, which means that in either case anyone who is Jewish is suffering from some kind of mental problems associated with the Holocaust or the denial thereof, and defendant believes it would be impossible for such a person acting as a judge to be impartial toward defendant, who will almost certainly be viewed as a threat, whereas defendant avers that his desire to destroy Judaism is actually motivated by a desire to see that the horrors of Jewish history don't repeat themselves. Defendant

should add that he believes raising a child as an anti-Semite is a form of child abuse, that's one of the complaints he has against his ex-wife, that although defendant went to a Catholic high school the woman he took to his prom was Jewish, and his closest friend during the 1980's was Alan Rudman, son of former Senator Warren Rudman (who is Jewish), and defendant grew up in Randolph, which had and still has a large Jewish population, and defendant didn't see that the Jewish community had any more knuckleheads per capita than the Christians.

Justice Lasker shouldn't take defendant's desire to destroy Judaism personally. Defendant also wants to destroy Christianity, Islam, and Hinduism. He also wants to destroy the adversarial system of American justice and replace it with a system where everyone tells the truth and doesn't hide behind lawyers (similar to justice systems which exist in every good home), and he also wants to re-educate judges and everyone else to such pervasive American fallacies as that "We are a nation of laws and not of men" (since no nation is a nation of laws; every nation builds human discretion into its legal systems); "Democracy is the best form of government" (if that were true, all corporations and government agencies would be democratic; instead, none of them are); "The Supreme Court interprets the constitution" (if that were true, they must be some of the louisiest interpreters on the planet, because the justices frequently come to directly opposing "interpretations" by votes of 5-4, 6-3, or 7-2; the truth is that the justices superimpose their personal views on the rest of the country and are accountable to no one for doing so, and any country which leaves the most important decisions of its citizens' lives in the hands of nine American-style lawyers is per se a bit looney).

Defendant also wants to replace the world's dominant economic principle, because as things now stand that principle is that at every meal everyone in the house (planet earth) leaps at the table and grabs as much food as they possibly can, and to heck with everyone else, whereas defendant thinks the rule should be that everyone be polite and make sure everyone in the house gets enough to eat, and only then can they beat the heck out of each other (also, they all need clean water, sanitary living conditions, etc., but we can't expect the court to do anything about that, because the court is so consumed with idiotic minutiae that it loses the forest for all the trees it keeps slamming into).

Furthermore, Justice Lasker is so inculcated in American jurisprudence that he, like the system itself, is pathologically incapable of protecting defendant's little girl. Defendant would have had better protection for his daughter if he had been




living back in cave-man days than he's had with the assortment of clowns, idiots, poseurs and incompetents who populate the so-called child protective agencies of the government, including the court. The system requires that Justice Lasker rely on these clowns, idiots, poseurs and incompetents to provide a background as to defendant's behavior. Defendant contends that he was an absolutely great father (and everyone who has actually seen defendant with his daughter, including the mother, has said he was a kind, patient, loving father) except for one thing - defendant trusted that DSS, the police and the courts would protect defendant's child. One reason they didn't is because their standards are so low that perhaps what defendant calls abuse they don't, but there is no way defendant is going to lower his standards to conform to cruel, ugly, sadistic American standards of child-rearing. Instead, America is going to have to raise its standards to conform with defendant's standards. That's non-negotiable. Judge Lasker may say that it is not his job to protect defendant's daughter. Defendant says, "Nonsense." Protecting defendant's daughter is the job of every judge who comes into contact with this case. If defendant's daughter is protected, defendant is not a threat. If defendant's daughter is not protected, defendant must be a threat, or else he is unfit to be a father.

Questionable control over courtroom personnel -- During the June 8, 2004 hearing the court stenographer made inappropriate, unprofessional facial expressions of disapproval at defendant, which is absolutely out of line and could indicate that Justice Lasker doesn't have appropriate control over the personnel in his courtroom, which if true is unacceptable, because a jury will naturally consider courtroom employees to be ethical, moral, law-abiding people so that any indication of disapproval that they make in the courtroom regarding any defendant will be seen as quasi-official disapproval by a good person, when of course there is no way to know whether a court stenographer, court clerk, bailiff, federal marshal, judge or any other official in the courtroom is a good person or is any more ethical, moral or law-abiding, by virtue of their position, than is a perverted Catholic priest, so defendant suggests that Justice Lasker tell the court stenographer, and everyone else, to stifle their disapproving looks and remain neutral in the courtroom, and defendant also suggests that all courtroom personnel be reminded of this important principle prior to every trial for every defendant everywhere in the United States (in fact, this principle is so important that defendant may make a separate motion on this issue and we can call the warning to court personnel everywhere in the United States "the Lasker

warning", and we'll let Justice Lasker write it up so he can be immortalized.

This case calls for an active judge, not a retired one -- Defendant should have an active judge, not a retired one, as befits the importance of the case, which defendant suspects Justice Lasker sees as merely another railroad operation from the court to a federal prison, although Justice Lasker himself should be suspect of railroad operations, which defendant feels is reminiscent of the Heinrich Himmler operations in Nazi Germany, although the American government sugar-coats the deal by not jam-packing the boxcars so prisoners die en route or working the prisoners to death, or gassing them. Of course, before Hitler began exterminating the Jews he exterminated the "mentally ill", but one rarely hears about that, because the deaths of some people are more important than the deaths of others, especially to certain members of the American media. Still, given that the cost of imprisonment is at least \$35,000 per prisoner per year, and that the cost of saving a child through the "Save the Children Fund" is \$25 per month, or \$300 per year, the so-called "opportunity cost" of imprisoning people in the United States is the deaths of about 117 children (\$35,000/\$300), although the deaths of 117 children, times more than 500,000 non-violent prisoners nationwide which equals more than 58,500,000 dead children (500,000 x 117), is no big deal to the American government, so we can see why defendant's daughter counts for nothing to a nation of people who worship a god whose big claim to fame in the Old Testament was the murder of a bunch of beautiful babies and toddlers from Egypt.

  
James T. Richards  
N.C.C.C., PMD-9  
200 West St.  
Dedham, MA 02027